



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#12  
mlf  
6/5/01

In re application of

Christian Tonna et al

Serial No.: 09/220,462

Filed: December 23, 1998

Title: ELEVATOR DOOR SYSTEM

RECEIVED

MAY 3 1 2001

Group 2100

Examiner: S. McAllister

Art Unit: 2167

Docket No.: OT-4224

RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

on May 24, 2001  
Barbara Cecere  
Barbara Cecere

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action dated March 27, 2001 in which claims 16-21 are finally rejected.

1,2. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected as obvious over Yoshikawa in view of Aulanko et al (Aulanko). There is no suggestion or motivation to modify the references (MPEP 2143.01). Aulanko describes a traction sheave for driving the elevator ropes. There is no suggestion in it that it should be used for any other purpose, and more particularly no suggestion that it should be used in door motors.

More importantly, Aulanko discloses combining the motor with the sheave that is driven by the motor. In the concept of Yoshikawa, Aulanko only suggests that the motor 9a and the belt driver 9b of Yoshikawa could be replaced with an integrated motor and belt driver. Certainly, Aulanko does not suggest that Yoshikawa can throw away the belt drivers 9b, toothed belt pulley 9c, toothed belt pulley 14, toothed belt 15, and toothed belt 9d. The invention of claims 16 is not simply for an elevator door drive in which the motor and the drive pulley are combined, but also that the combined motor and drive sheave directly drive "a rope forming a closed loop about the first and second sheaves." There is no suggestion that the initial application of power to effect movement of the door-driving rope, encircling a pair of sheaves, should be made directly to one of those sheaves; in

fact, Yoshikawa teaches the opposite, since his solution to the long-belt problem retains all the toothed belts and toothed pulleys (MPEP 2141.02; 2145(j)(4); 2143.01; 2145XD). This is a prerequisite to any relevance of Aulanko; absent any suggestion that the rope should be driven by power applied directly to one of its encompassed sheaves, Aulanko is irrelevant. There is no motivation to combine the references (MPEP 706.02(j)); but even if there were, the combination of these two references would not result in the claimed subject matter, as described hereinbefore. Stated alternatively, the claim as a whole has not been suggested by a combination of Aulanko into Yoshikawa (MPEP 2141.02).

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 as obvious over Yoshikawa and Aulanko is hereby respectfully requested.

3. Since claims 17-21 depend from claim 16, they are patentable for the same reasons (MPEP 2143.03). Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 17-21 is hereby respectfully requested.

4,5. Since the rejection was shown to be improper, withdrawal of the final rejection is hereby requested (MPEP 706.07(e)).

6. Should the foregoing not be persuasive, a telephone call to the undersigned is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,



M. P. Williams  
Reg. No. 19,220  
Voice: 860-649-0305  
Fax: 860-649-1385

Otis Intellectual Property Department  
10 Farm Springs  
Farmington, CT 06032  
Date: May 24, 2001